

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ENGIDASHET W. GEBRE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CONDOLEEZA RICE,  
as Secretary of State, and  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 05-11321-WGY

**PARTIES' JOINT STATEMENT  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 16.1(D)**

Plaintiff and Defendant hereby submit the following joint statement regarding pre-trial scheduling.

Plaintiff, Engidashet W. Gebre, an Ethiopian national, filed a complaint in this Court on June 23, 2005, to compel the issuance of an immigrant visa to his wife, Tiringo T. Tegebelu, on the basis of the immigrant Diversity Visa program which is administered by the Department of State. Plaintiff was issued an immigrant visa as a Diversity applicant on August 20, 2002, pursuant to the diversity visa lottery program for the year 2002. At that time Tiringo T. Tegebelu appeared with him and applied for an immigrant Diversity Visa as his spouse. Her application was denied, and he is requesting a mandamus order to issue an immigrant visa to her now.

Plaintiff contends that his wife's Immigrant Visa application was processed correctly on the same day, and therefore, his wife's Immigrant Visa should have been granted. The government asserts that there was no error in denying an Immigrant Visa to Plaintiff's spouse,

YOUNG, D.C. / *as modified*  
So ordered as the case management  
scheduling order.

Discovery due April 7, 2006

Dispositive Motions due April 7, 2006

*William A. Young*  
U.S. District Judge  
*Nov 15, 2005*

and that Plaintiff's wife is procedurally barred from entering the United States under the Diversity Visa program.

1. **Automatic Disclosure Pursuant to Local Rule 26.2(A)**

This case seeks review of a final agency action based on the agency's administrative record. The administrative record for the administrative proceedings is being compiled by the Department of State and will be made available to Plaintiff's counsel by December 21, 2005.

2. **Joint Discovery Plan**

This case seeks review of a final agency action based on the agency's administrative record and is not expected to require traditional discovery. The case is likely to involve motion practice and may eventually be disposed of on a Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment. Therefore, the Defendants believe that discovery is not necessary at this time. However, each party reserves the right to file a motion with the Court to request discovery if they believe discovery is warranted.

3. **Proposed Procedural and Motion Schedule**

December 21, 2005 Department of State administrative record made available to Plaintiff's counsel.

January 30, 2006 Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery filed.

March 3, 2006 Defendants' Opposition and Reply filed. *WJY*  
Oral argument and/or hearings at the Court's discretion.

April 7, 2006 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and/or for Summary Judgment filed.

May 5, 2006 Plaintiff's Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment filed. *WJY*  
Oral argument and/or hearings at the Court's discretion.

**4. Certification of Budget and ADR Conference**

**Plaintiff**

Plaintiffs' counsel certifies that he has conferred with the plaintiff: (1) with a view toward establishing a budget for the costs of conducting the full course – and various alternative courses – of the litigation; and (2) to consider the resolution of the litigation through the use of alternative dispute resolution programs such as those outlined in Local Rule 16.4.

**Defendants**

Defendants' counsel certifies that he has conferred with an authorized representative of the defendant: (1) with a view toward establishing a budget for the costs of conducting the full course – and various alternative courses – of the litigation; and (2) to consider the resolution of the litigation through the use of alternative dispute resolution programs such as those outlined in Local Rule 16.4.

The certification of all parties and their respective counsels are in the process of being obtained.

**5. Settlement Proposals**

There are no settlement proposals pending at this time. However, the parties are exploring the availability of alternative programs and procedures to facilitate the entry of Plaintiff's spouse to the United States.

Respectfully submitted,

For the Plaintiff,

ENGIDASHET W. GEBRE

By: /s/ Benjamin B. Tariri

Benjamin B. Tariri  
128A Tremont Street  
Boston, MA 02108  
Tel: (617) 574-9080  
Fax: (617) 574-9070  
BBO# 652042

For the Defendant,

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN  
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Anton P. Giedt

Anton P. Giedt  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
1 Courthouse Way  
Boston, MA 02210  
617-748-3309 (Voice)  
617-748-3971 (Fax)  
[anton.giedt@usdoj.gov](mailto:anton.giedt@usdoj.gov)

**Of Counsel:**

Gordon Dickey  
Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser  
For Consular Affairs (L/CA)  
U.S. Department of State, Rm 5526  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20520  
202-647-0688 (Voice)  
202-647-0083 (Fax)

DATED: November 14, 2005

DATED: November 14, 2005

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Suffolk, ss.

Boston, Massachusetts

DATE: November 14, 2005

I, Anton P. Giedt, Assistant U.S. Attorney, do hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing upon the Plaintiff's counsel of record electronically.

/s/ Anton P. Giedt

Anton P. Giedt

Assistant U.S. Attorney

**PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL:**

Benjamin B. Tariri  
128A Tremont Street  
Boston, MA 02108  
Tel: (617) 574-9080  
Fax: (617) 574-9070  
BBO# 652042

**AGENCY COUNSEL:**

<mailto:sheila.skojcek@faa.gov> Gordon Dickey  
Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser  
For Consular Affairs (L/CA)  
U.S. Department of State, Rm 5526  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20520  
202-647-0688 (Voice)  
202-647-0083 (Fax)